

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of above amendments and following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-67 are pending in this application. Claims 5-7, 14, 16-18, 21-22, 24-28, 31-33, 36, 38, 40-45, 47, 49-53 and 55-59 are withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 34 and 60-61 are amended; Claims 66-67 are added; and no claims are canceled herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 60 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1-4, 8-10, 13, 19, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 46, 48, 54, and 60-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,665,901 to Spector; Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 19, 20, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 46, 48, 54, and 60-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 1,947,720 to Laub in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,145,147 to Schuck; Claims 15, 23, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Laub in view of Schuck and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,070,102 to McDonald; Claims 11 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Spector; and Claims 15, 23 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Spector in view of McDonald.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 60 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Claims 60 and 61 are amended by the present amendment. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Spector does not teach or suggest an applicator portion having a first surface configured to engage a portion of a body during use and a second surface secured to a second side of a reservoir located

immediately adjacent to the second surface of the applicator, as claimed in Claim 1 and similarly claimed in Claim 34.

Instead, Spector discloses a periodontal finger applicator that includes a collapsible thimble 10 which fits on the index finger of the user and is attached to an envelope 13. The envelope 13 defines a cavity 14 for the aqueous solution, an internal cavity 16 to hold the dry powder, and a rectangular layer 17 made of sponge-like material. The cavity 14 filled with the aqueous solution is formed adjacent the finger and the internal cavity 16 is formed between the cavity 14 and the application layer 17.

Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion for the features recited in the independent claims. Again, the independent claims recite that the applicator portion has a second surface secured to an immediately adjacent second side of the reservoir. As such, during use, the stored product can move reliably from the reservoir immediately to the applicator portion and then be applied to a desired surface. In contrast, Spector requires the aqueous solution in portion 14 to first mix with the powder in portion 18 before reaching layer 17.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Spector does not teach or suggest that the membrane forms the entire second side of the reservoir and the second surface of the applicator portion and membrane have a substantially same area, as recited in Claim 60. Nor does Spector teach or suggest that the second surface of the applicator portion and the membrane have a respective length, said second surface and said membrane surface being in contact with each other on substantially all their length, as recited in Claim 66. Instead, Spector discloses a front wall of envelope 13 includes a weakened zone 15 located between the aqueous solution cavity 14 and dry powder cavity 16. However, the weakened zone 15 is formed over a very small area compared to the remainder of the layer in between cavities 14 and 16. In contrast, the claimed invention recites that the second surface of the applicator

portion and membrane have substantially the same area. This feature is not taught or suggested in the applied art.

Further, Spector does not teach or suggest that the means to attach the applicator includes an adhesive layer able to adhesively couple the applicator device to the finger, as recited in Claim 67. Instead, Spector discloses a collapsible thimble 10 which fits on the index finger 11 of a user.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Laub discloses a toothbrush having a container 10 formed with sidewalls having ribs 16 and 17 to secure a finger holder 18. A paste 12 is contained within a hollow portion of the container 10. When it is desired to extrude the paste through the slot formed in the housing 10, the upper wall of the container is depressed in the membrane 29 is fractured to allow the paste 12 into the area of bristles 25. That is, when the membrane is broken, the openings in Laub are located in an area between the bristles 25, which is remote from the applicator portion.

Schuck discloses a toothbrush having a cavity 106 for housing toothpaste. The cavity 106 communicates with channel 105 which then dispenses the toothpaste to the bristle portion 104 of the brush. Schuck also discusses using sponge material 120. In operation, a screw and piston device operated by the user, forces the toothpaste out of the cavity and into the bristle or sponge area.

Accordingly, the features of the claimed invention discussed above are not taught or suggested by the teachings in either Laub or Schuck. Further, it is respectfully submitted that there is no basis in the teachings of either Laub or Schuck to support their applied combination. Certainly, the outstanding Office Action fails to cite to any specific teachings within either reference to support the applied combination. Again, Laub is concerned with the dispensing of toothpaste between bristles 25 which is remote from the applicator portion. Schuck is directed to the dispensing of toothpaste with a piston and screw device through a

channel. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Laub with Schuck is the result of hindsight reconstruction in view of the teachings of the present specification, and is improper.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

---

Steven P. Weihrouch  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 32,829

Kevin M. McKinley  
Registration No. 43,794

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

SPW/KMM/law

I:\ATTY\KMM\PROSECUTION WORK\239209\11-30-07 AMENDMENT.DOC

Robert T. Pous  
Registration No. 29,099